

REMARKS

Claims 33 – 55 are now pending in the application. Claims 1 – 32 have been cancelled. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy extended during a phone conversation on January 25, 2006 (hereinafter phone conversation) in which Applicant discussed the pending claims in view of the art of record. During the phone conversation, Applicant and the Examiner discussed features provided in the instant application that, in combination, are not taught nor suggested by the collective prior art. Specifically, the instant invention provides a motor contained within a driven roller of a belt sander wherein the driven roller provides a free end. Applicant and the Examiner agree that the prior art does not teach or suggest a motor contained within the driven roller of a belt sander. While Syverson (U.S. Pat. No. 6,244,427) shows a driven roller as part of a conveyor belt, Applicant discussed with the Examiner the limitations of a driven roller in a conveyor belt. Specifically, in a conveyor belt application, the driven roller (and all non-driven rollers) is fixed at opposite ends to the structure of the conveyor system. Such a limitation (rollers being captured on both ends) would preclude an operator from sliding a new belt around the rollers from one end, a process that is repeated each time an exhausted piece of sandpaper is replaced on a belt sander.

The instant invention provides the structure of a belt sander wherein first ends of the driven and non-driven roller are free. As a result, a roll of sandpaper may be introduced through the space provided between the free ends of the rollers and the body of the belt sander. Pursuant to the phone conversation, and at the Examiner's recommendation, new claims have been added that reflect the combination of structural

limitations provided by the belt sander. The structural limitations include an electric motor defining the driven roller, wherein the driven roller has a free end proximate the body. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) directed to claims 12 – 32 and allow new claims 33 – 55 in view of the remarks contained herein.

NEW CLAIMS 33 - 55

Applicant notes that new claims 33 – 55 generally correspond to cancelled claims 12 – 32. The new claims 33 – 55 recite limitations included in cancelled claims 12 – 32 and also include additional structure of the belt sander as discussed during the phone conversation referenced above. Specifically, independent claims 33, 44 and 51 have been written to recite the combination of a motor contained within a driven roller and wherein the driven roller includes a free end extending proximate to the body element of the belt sander.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 12 – 16 and 22 – 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,475,075 (Wuensch), in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,244,427 (Syverson). Claims 12 – 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 4,574,531 (McCurry) in view of Syverson. Claim 29 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 3,566,548 (Beckering) in view of Syverson. Claims 30-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beckering in view of McCurry. For the

reasons set forth in the Response to Office action filed on August 9, 2005, Applicant submits that claims 12 – 32 patentably define the subject invention over the art of record. In an effort to expedite prosecution, however, claims 12 – 32 have been cancelled in favor of the new claims. In view of the phone conversation, Applicant believes that new claims 33 – 55 present patentable subject matter over the art of record.


As such, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 33 – 55 are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600 or email at bdhollis@hdp.com.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 26, 2006

By: 

Brian D. Hollis, Reg. No. 51,075
Stephen T. Olson, Reg. No. 36,626

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600
BDH:cr